

Oxford Democrat.

VOLUME 2.

PARIS, MAINE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1835.

NUMBER 21

OXFORD DEMOCRAT,
IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY BY
GEORGE W. MILLETT.
TERMS—One dollar and fifty cents in advance.
—One dollar and seventy-five cents at the end of six months.
—Two dollars at the end of the year.
No paper discontinued till all dues are paid, but at the option of the Publisher.
ADVERTISEMENTS inserted on the usual terms; the proprietor not being accountable for any error in any advertisement beyond the amount charged for it.
COMMUNICATIONS, and LETTERS on business must be addressed to the publisher, Post-paid.

THE BANK.

We invite the particular attention of our readers to the masterly letter of Secretary Woodbury in reply to one Mr. Biddle in relation to the French bill. It is one of the severest castigations we recollect ever to have seen. Its severity is only equalled by its truth.

Succo Demo.

Treasury Department,
December 12th, 1834.

In obedience to a resolution of the House of Representatives, passed the 11th inst.

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to communicate to the House of Representatives, as soon as practicable, copies of the correspondence, not heretofore communicated, which has taken place between him and the President of the Bank of the United States, on the subject of the Branch Drafts, and in relation to the claim made by the Bank for damages, and the course pursued by that institution on account of the protest of the bill drawn on the French Government by the Treasury Department."

I have the honor to report, that the only correspondence on those subjects not heretofore communicated to Congress, which has taken place between the President of the Bank of the United States and this Department, consists on his part of two letters, one received on the 28th, and the other on the 30th ult.

That which related to the "damages" and the course pursued by the Bank on account of the protest of the bill drawn on the French Government, has been deemed of most public importance, has been answered, and copies of his letter, and the reply of this Department, are herewith communicated.

The other letter related to the late Circular from the Treasury, declining to receive the branch drafts in payment of the public dues after the close of the present year—and as it wished the department distinctly to "understand it is not at all against the measure itself, but only the reasons assigned for it, that any objection is made," there did not seem to be much public necessity for hastening a reply. But as soon as the great pressure of the current business in this office may permit, one shall be completed, and copies of both transmitted to the House of Representatives.

LEVI WOODBURY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. JOHN BELL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Bank of the United States,
Nov. 28th, 1834.

SIR: Your favor of the 13th of July last, reached the Bank during my absence, and finding on my return that my letter addressed to you at Washington, had been published in the newspapers of Nashville, it seemed useless to prolong a discussion which could only inflame the passions of the country in the midst of its elections. I have therefore foreborne to answer your letter until the time had passed for the repetition of a similar appeal from the laws.

The whole case appears to be exceedingly simple. There is a difference of opinion between the Treasury and the Bank about the damages on a bill of exchange. This is a matter of account which depends on the existing laws, and the acts of Congress provide specifically before what tribunal and in what manner, the question must be tried. Thus by the act of the 3d of March, 1797, it is provided, that if any person, accountable for public money, fails to pay it, "it shall be the duty of the Comptroller, and he is hereby required to institute suit for the recovery of the same," and in such suit "no claim for a credit shall be admitted upon trial, but such as shall appear to have been presented to the Accounting Officers of the Treasury for their examination," and by them disallowed in whole or in part. The Bank has accordingly presented its account for damages, which has been disallowed. It has then retained a sufficient amount of public money for the purpose, and invited a suit by the Treasury so as to bring the subject before the court. It did this and so stated it, "as the best if not the only mode" of settling the question. But as the money itself was an object of indifference to the Bank, which sought only to vindicate its own rights, and the retaining of it was a mere form, to comply with the act of Congress, the Bank at the same time requested from the Secretary to know, whether there was any other mode of submitting the rights of the respective parties to the judicial tribunals more acceptable to him—and would instantly have released the money on any arrangement with the Treasury to bring the case before the courts.

There is still more summary process of obtaining a decision. By the act of Congress

of May 15th, 1820, if the public money be withheld, the first Comptroller of the Treasury can issue a warrant of distress against the party in default, who may then appeal to the Courts of the United States.

Either of these courses is open to the Executive. If it chooses neither, the Bank having done its duty, is content. Before the proper tribunal, the Bank will always be ready to prove.

1. That the bill of exchange on the French Government was drawn without the slightest authority whatever from that Government to draw it.

2. That the Bank proposed to the Treasury to collect the money as its agent, and not to pay it until it was received from France, thus avoiding the very embarrassment which has occurred; but this the Treasury declined, and requested the immediate payment by the Bank as a purchaser.

3. That of the money so paid by the Bank, the whole was immediately appropriated by the Treasury, and a part used in the current expenses of the Government.

4. That when the bill was protested in Paris as was inevitable, and the money paid by the agents of the Bank, to save the credit of the Treasury, the claim of damages by the Bank was an indispensable act of duty, as that alone would enable the Treasury to claim damages from the French Government, which, if the Treasury had any right to draw at all, was as much due as the principal.

5. That the universal and inflexible rule of the Treasury is to make every one pay damages; and as it had required of the Stockholders of the Bank to pay damages, when their bills sold to the Treasury have been protested, so should it now pay damages to those stockholders, when they in turn have bought a bill from the Treasury which becomes protested.

All this will be made manifest whenever the Treasury resorts to the proper tribunal. Until then, it seems unjust to prejudge the question, and quite fruitless to discuss it.

I have the honor to be,
very respectfully, yours,

(Signed) *N. BIDDLE, President.*
Hon. Levi Woodbury,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Treasury Department,
Dec. 11th, 1834.

SIR: Your communication of the 28th ult. acknowledging the receipt of my letter of the 13th of July last, relative to the detention of the public dividends by the Bank of the United States, was duly received.

After a silence of more than four months, coupled with the hostile position the Bank had assumed, it was supposed that you did not contemplate entering into further correspondence in respect to this subject, and especially as it was supposed, that a correspondence would not be resumed, with an avowed view to any explanations or new arrangements, at so late a period, that your communication could not reach this department till the day previous to that session of Congress to which you had been early apprised a report would be made on the whole proceedings of the Bank in this extraordinary transaction.

Presuming, therefore, that the Bank ought to have felt all the reluctance expressed in your letter, "to prolong a discussion" on that transaction, which cannot but be admitted, from its unprecedented and unjustifiable character, was well calculated to "inflame the passions of the country," and that this circumstance might naturally have led to the postponement of a reply till after the elections, yet no reason is assigned in your explanation, whatever may be the reason conjectured by others, for the failure to forward that reply immediately after the popular elections had terminated, and in season for a suitable examination of its contents before Congress convened.

But it would be unjust to the Bank not to return thanks for the very considerate sentiment expressed in your apology for the first delay—a wish not "to prolong a discussion which would only inflame the passions of the country in the midst of its elections." This Department regrets that so powerful a corporation—though perhaps unable to restrain, and therefore not so responsible for the harrangues of some of its advocates, on whatever days, places, or occasions—had not, in its own resolutions, reports of committees, and essays and pamphlets, published by its President, under a vote to cause to be prepared and circulated such documents and papers as may communicate to the people information in regard to the nature and operations of the Bank—earlier sent a little more effort to practice the same forbearance from attempting to inflame the passions of the country. How fully the Bank can now become the censor of the President of this Department, for also communicating "to the people information on the nature and operations of the Bank," and that information consisting only of official correspondence on both sides—must be left to others to decide.

Your last letter having at length been received, and having, as appears, been already sent to the newspapers by the Bank, without waiting for a reply, and before any of the great pressure of business at this season, could

be expected, its contents are in some particulars found to be so extraordinary in their tone, in their allusions, and assertions, that, unpleasant as the task is, this Department has, under all the circumstances, felt constrained to submit such remarks in relation to them as are deemed appropriate, and seem imperatively to be required. The Bank may therefore, sir, rest assured, that though your letter arrived so late as to prevent the submission of it to the President, before preparing his annual message, or to the Attorney General before his opinion was requested on the case, and as to deprive the undersigned from offering any due comment on it in his report to Congress concerning this subject, yet, in relation to the affairs of which it treats, an "appeal" from the laws, has never, as you appear to intimate, been made by this department, nor is one in contemplation. Any such "appeal" is left to those who, without the sanction of an appropriation by Congress, or without a legal precept, seize upon public property, and convert it to their own private emolument. But, after a violation of the rights of the United States, and a diversion of its revenue from the Treasury and the public service, into the vaults of the Bank, if the latter expects that the Chief Executive Magistrate of the Union, or the Secretary of the Treasury, will be silent, and not communicate early and full information concerning the outrage to the People and their Representatives—and that those public officers are to be deterred from this discharge of a solemn duty, because the Bank entertains an opinion, that such a course is an "appeal from the laws," you have yet to learn, that both the character of that Chief Magistrate and the obligations of duty entertained by this Department, have been greatly misapprehended.

In proceeding to the other contents of your letter, it is conceded with you, that the whole case appears exceedingly simple. The Bank sets up a claim against the United States. It is presented and disallowed by the accounting officers because considered in itself neither equitable nor legal; because it never had received the sanction of the U. States by an appropriation of public money, but any constitutional power to appropriate as payment.

Thereupon, the Bank, instead of resorting to Congress for that sanction, proceeded without it, and without any legal precept, to seize on the dividends belonging to the United States, and to convert them to its private use. The vital error of the Bank on this subject appears to have been, in supposing that the Treasury and its accounting officers were any thing but mere agents of Congress to superintend the settlement of what has been appropriated. If, on the solicitation of the Bank, or any individual, however powerful, they allowed or settled any thing else than had been sanctioned by an appropriation, it would manifestly be converting at peculation, or a misapplication of the public money. It must be well known to the Bank, that the first and proper inquiry at the Treasury to every applicant is where is the appropriation to pay the claim? And next, where is the evidence of its correctness, under the appropriation? It seems rather unreasonable to insist, that the Treasury possesses almost unlimited power when the Bank wants favors, but to deny to it almost all power when apprehending danger from it.

Besides all the decisive reasons against the reprehensible conduct of the Bank in this transaction, which are contained in the late Message of the President and in the opinion of the Attorney General, the Bank, if it possesses, as has been intimated, an other controverted claim against the United States, for the removal of the public deposits, might on this principle, in order to discharge it, or atone for any other pretended wrong, not only refuse to pay over dividends, but refuse, to the amount claimed, the payment of its notes or bills received by the Treasury for the public revenue; and when this consideration is weighed, it will readily be seen that the whole operations of the Government, in war and peace, while, by law, the notes of the Bank must be received for the public revenue, are liable, at the pleasure of the Bank, to be paralyzed, and the public faith thereby violated.

After these objections, and when the common, the equitable, and constitutional tribunal of Congress was, and still is for the Bank, as for all other claimants against the Government, similarly situated, open for a resort to obtain damages—it is lamented, that the Bank was so inconsiderately advised as to appeal to this other course, so novel, dangerous, and unnecessary, of seizing upon the public revenue, as being in your opinion "the best, if not the only course of settling the question." You state further, that this has been done by the Bank only "to vindicate its own rights," when no case is believed to exist when a person not receiving money as an officer or contractor of the Government, or money not previously granted by Congress under some special or general appropriation (in which mode the Bank did receive these dividends) has ever been known to "vindicate" its supposed "rights," by retaining the money to meet any claims, however

large, and when application by the Bank for relief in this

case, had never been presented to Congress, and refused so as to furnish the slightest apology for being obliged in order to procure redress, to resort to this unusual remedy.

But if the views of the Department on this proceeding be erroneous, much gratification would be derived from having the particular act and clause quoted by the Bank, on which it relies in making the assertion, that "the retaining of this money was a mere form to comply with the act of Congress." This Department has not been so fortunate as to discover any statute, and much less the one cited of March 3d, 1797, which requires of a claimant against the Government, that he should, in a controverted case seize its property in order "to comply with the act of Congress;" nor any statute which authorizes, recognizes, or palliates such a seizure, in order to force the Government into a law suit, and thus, through the agency of the judiciary, attempt to effect the payment of doubtful claims; to which no money has been appropriated nor legislative sanction given. The proposition of the Bank to make some arrangement to have this question brought "before the Courts," and the assurance now given, that, in such an event, it "would immediately have released the money," would have deserved much more attention, and stronger confidence, had this assurance been more promptly given, and that amicable disposition, now manifested, been earlier evinced by the Bank, in having at least requested such an arrangement before the dividends were withheld. Before committing that aggression, the Bank was not pleased even to notify the Treasury that it wished the question of damages settled by litigation and it communicated not the slightest intimation of a desire to make any "arrangement with the Treasury to bring the case before the Courts." But the Bank having, on these points preserved perfect silence, and the Department and Congress having been thus lulled into security till after the adjournment of the latter, then suddenly and without previous notice, a portion of the accruing revenue, estimated and expected to aid in meeting the large appropriations which had just been made, and to pay the residue of the public debt, was withheld by the Bank and was not offered to be restored till after the termination of a suit, probably protracted for many years. After committing that aggression, and still withholding in its possession the money of the United States, the Bank then, and not till then, "invited" this Department to bring the subject of the damages in some way before the courts, and thus indirectly to sanction the appeal of the Bank from the authority of Congress over this matter, and to acquiesce, till adjusted by litigation, in the Bank's unprecedented and ruinous course as the public revenue—a course involving a principle which, under all the circumstances of this case, if once adopted, might disorganize our whole collections, by the seizure of them, without legal precept, under one pretence or another, and, as previously explained, place even our disbursements, so far as the public funds consist of United States Bank notes, at the sole mercy of an irritated and unscrupulous corporation. But this the Department could not sanction, however urgently "invited," without proving faithless to every principle of public duty and public safety.

Late as even that invitation, it is remarkable that your letters expressed nothing about the money itself—"being an object of indifference to the Bank," or that it "would instantly have released the money in any arrangement with the Treasury to bring the case before the courts." On the contrary, though some persons may for a time have apprehended from certain circumstances, that money was "an object of indifference to the Bank" in comparison with some other objects, yet it is difficult to discover "what rights" the Bank then sought to "vindicate," except its rights to the money, and why it should be so tenacious of its rights to the money itself. By your correspondence at that time, the money appears to have been withheld with the express view to force the Department into a consent to pay the controverted damages claimed, without any sanction by Congress, or into some arrangement to submit to the judiciary for decision, a question which, under the constitution and circumstances of the case, belongs to Congress alone, and, after that decision, and not till then, if unfavorable, to make a restoration of the dividends, the Bank had so unexpectedly seized, in derogation of the laws. It was not until the time had passed for the repetition of a similar appeal from the laws by the Bank to cover its other intimated claims for damages, on account of the removal of the deposits, with any probable hope of public approbation in favor of its new mode of aiding the fiscal operations of the Government, and not till after those elections to which you refer, may, in your opinion, have terminated so disastrously to its hopes, that the Bank professed a perfect "indifference" about the money, and a willingness to release it, in case an arrangement was effected for a suit at law.

How a suit could still proceed, and the money be first released or repaid must be left to the Bank for further explanation, as it is inconceivable to this Department, unless affected through some fictitious case, to be agreed on in order to deprive Congress of its constitutional

power over appropriations to settle contested claims against the United States, and which agreement, you may rest assured, that this Department has as little inclination as it has legitimate power to make.

It may be proper then to state further and distinctly, that the submission of the whole case to the wisdom and authority of Congress, appears to the Treasury to be the only suitable course, and that it cannot enter into any arrangement in relation to the subject, except to receive, as requested in its communication to the Bank in July last, the dividends due to the United States, and to refer the Bank, as is done with other claimants in similar cases, to the justice of Congress for any damages demanded on the bill of exchange beyond the actual expenses and costs incurred. The acknowledgments of this Department should not be omitted for your kindness in pointing out more than one mode that might be pursued in the Courts of law against the Bank; but, as the advice of an opposing party is not always safest, and as Congress is competent to give directions upon the claim of the United States, and is considered the proper tribunal for adjusting the claim of the Bank, your benevolent suggestions will, it is feared, prove unavailing; especially, since the summary process to which you now allude, besides being open to other objections, is in express terms and by a decision of the Courts, applicable to the case only of debtors, who, unlike the Bank in this instance, obtain possession of the public money, in their capacity of public officers. What may be the design now in making, "for obtaining a decision," a proposition which would doubtless fail if accepted, is best known to yourself and such "distinguished" counsel of the Bank as you cite to this Department, in your other published letter of the 26th ult. It must be admitted that the Bank, in the next, place, evinces great frankness in proceeding to disclose, under five separate specifications, what it expects to prove on trial. Whether there is much likelihood that this expectation will ever be realized, others must decide; but the ingenuousness in stating beforehand to the opposite party what is to be proved against him, should not pass without due commendation, though it is regretted, that under all the circumstances, a suspicion—it may be an unjust one—has arisen, that the statement was made rather with a view to be immediately laid before the community by the Bank, either to "inflame the passions" or to forestall public opinion on these points before a reply was received from this Department.

In laying down the first position which the Bank asserts it "will always be ready to prove," viz: "that the Bill of Exchange on the French Government was drawn without the slightest authority whatever from the Government," it is feared that the zeal of the Bank, to vindicate the treaty, in which that Government expressly stipulates to pay "the sum of twenty-five millions of francs, at Paris in six annual instalments, of four millions one hundred and sixty thousand six hundred and sixty six centimes each, into the hand of such person or persons as shall be authorized by the Government of the United States to receive it." The Bank appears, moreover, to have forgotten the written authority, under seal from the President of the United States, which accompanied the bill, and empowered the holder as the person designated under the treaty and in pursuance of it, to receive the money, which had then become honestly due from the French Government, and should, notwithstanding your apology, have been promptly paid, according to every principle of national good faith. In your ardent defence of a foreign country, for a neglect to fulfill its treaties, and attack upon a Department of your own, "for acting without the slightest authority whatever," it also seems to have escaped notice, that the Treasury acted, not only under the authority before named, from France, of a solemn stipulation to make the payment to any "persons" "authorized by the Government of the United States"—and that the holders of this bill were so specially authorized by this Department and the President; but that Congress had previously empowered and required the Secretary of the Treasury, by the act of July 13th, 1832, "to cause this money to be received from the French Government, and transferred to the U. States, in such manner as he may deem best." If, notwithstanding all this, unfortunately for your own country, the Bank should be able to support the position, that "the bill was drawn without the slightest authority" from France, you certainly will deserve her acknowledgments for the aid thus rendered to get rid probably of the whole of a claim which she has appeared not very eager to discharge; because, if France was not liable, under all the circumstances, to pay it in that form, it is difficult to discover how she is liable to pay it in any form.

It is to be regretted, that in your professions of regard for "the credit of the Treasury," knowing then as now what its authority was for drawing the bill, you did not refuse entirely to take it, as the Bank must have foreseen and believed, that the money would not probably be paid on an instrument, if drawn "without the slightest authority," and that the affair would probably end in a claim by it for large damages. Were it not for this solicitude, since ex-

pressed by the Bank, to accommodate the Treasury, and the "indifference" the Bank now professes "as to money," it might be inferred by some, that pursuing the before mentioned course, it must have meditated originally a speculation as to the protest and expected damages.

What seems at first rather inexplicable, is, that the Bank, knowing, and being ready to prove that this Department drew the bill, without the slightest authority, and hence could not require France to pay any damages, if the bill was protested—should yet insist, that the claims of damages by the Bank, was "an indispensable act of duty," to enable the Treasury to claim damages of the French Government. This great kindness towards the Government of your own country, uninvited and voluntarily to seize on its revenue, and attempt to plunge it into a lawsuit at home, and a controversy abroad, to enable it to obtain large damages of another country, which it must, if obtained immediately pay over to the Bank, certainly deserves all due acknowledgment. In fine, while the Bank is professing to give all this friendly advice for the benefit of the Treasury, and feel itself, a great indifference about the money, its regard for the Treasury upon this particular subject, seems, when stripped of all blandishments, to consist in urging the Government to demand, and to hazard a new quarrel with France to obtain, large and vindictive damages, by asserting that they are as much due "as the principal" when in fact the United States are entitled from France to only the reasonable and actual damages sustained, and when large and vindictive ones are to be sought in behalf, not of the Treasury, but of the disinterested institution which is urging this indefensible measure; and when, if such aggravated damages are obtained, they are expected to go at once, and exclusively, not into the Treasury, but into the vaults of the Bank; or, which is virtually the same, to supply the place of the great amount of public revenue the Bank has already on this account seized and withheld.

But notwithstanding this, if now, or at any other period, the Bank shall, as alleged, be ready to prove that "the money was paid by the agents of the Bank to save the credit of the Treasury," the favor will be cheerfully acknowledged by this Department, as in that event no right in the Bank to the aggravated damages claimed against the Treasury, and which had led to the outrage of seizing on the public dividends, could well be pretended to exist. It is hoped, as you profess to consider that "the claim of damages by the Bank was an indispensable act of duty," you will also not hesitate to perform another equally "indispensable act of duty," by furnishing, as early as practicable, the evidence to prove the point just mentioned; since if such evidence is furnished, not only should the aggravated damages be relinquished, but the conduct of those agents and of the Bank in that particular, be duly appreciated.

In that event, they of course, did not pay the money for "the credit of the Treasury" for the purpose of exacting from it, on account of the professed favor, the large constructive damages of \$150,000 or \$170,000, but, it must be presumed, they paid it with a view to save the Treasury from exposure to such a claim by some foreigner who might be heartless or sordid, and whose pecuniary profit being alone concerned, might be so destitute of patriotic feelings for this country as to permit the bill not only to be protested abroad, and the "credit of the Treasury" so suffer, as to have it returned home protested, but who might thereupon immediately make a demand on the Treasury beyond the actual damages and costs sustained and even for great, and it may be properly added, penal damages, and to pursue this demand in so inexorable a spirit as not to wait for the decision of Congress upon it, but, without legal precept or any previous notice of his design, to seize upon a large amount of the public revenue, for the purpose of discharging it.

In relation to your third head of proof, "that of the money so paid by the Bank, the whole was immediately appropriated by the Treasury and a part used in the current expenses of the Government," it gives me pleasure to attempt a correction thus early of these misapprehensions.

This Department has, in the reports sent here monthly by the direction of the President of the Bank, statements, which show that the amount standing to the credit of the public in the Bank, which of course includes its branches, was at no time after the purchase of the French Bill on the 11th of February, 1833, until the formal return of the money to the Bank on the 10th of May, 1833, less than eight millions of dollars. That of this at no time, was less than four millions left in the Bank and its branches, to the credit of the Treasurer, subject to draft for any purpose, and that the residuum deposited on account of the public debt, and of the public collecting and disbursing officers. So that whatever sum of money may have been "appropriated by the Treasury" or "used" between those periods, it still left in the vaults of the Bank and in its use, standing to credit of the Treasurer, at the times of all your intervening returns, a sum from three to four millions beyond the amount of the bill, or from three to four times more than the amount which you had, in form only, paid to the Treasury, or passed to its credit, in trust for the numerous sufferers by French spoliations. And no part of the sum received on the bill was ever so "appropriated" or "used" by the Treasury as to be carried into it by warrant; or it could not, until Congress should have passed a new law, have refunded, at aid, the whole

amount, the moment notice was given of the protest of the bill.

In regard to the practice which you cite of this Department in charging damages on ordinary bills of exchange bought of individuals who sustain no official relations with the Government, and who neglect to provide funds abroad to meet those bills and to pay punctually our creditors and officers in a foreign country, it is hardly necessary here to show the difference between the two cases, in both form and substance, after the preceding remarks, and after the views contained in the first opinion of the attorney General, published with the late annual report from this Department. Still less is it necessary to show further that in none of these cases probably did the idea ever enter into the imagination of the officers of the Government, that they ought, in order to obtain the damages due and often actually accruing to the full amount received on protested bills, to resort, without either notice, lawful process, or a previous adjudication, to a seizure of the property or dues of the individuals who drew and sold them. As in conclusion you give assurance that "all" your allegations "will be made manifest whenever the Treasury resorts to the proper tribunals," this Department takes the liberty to renew the expressions of its opinion, that it has already resorted to the proper tribunal, in the first instance, by submitting this whole transaction to the consideration of Congress, where you will doubtless be indulged with an opportunity, if desired, to make all your charges "manifest." But the Bank may "rest satisfied," that it will be long, unless otherwise directed by Congress, before this Department, however urgently "invited" by the Bank, will consent to enter into any arrangement, or to institute any proceedings, which, under existing circumstances, will, in their operation, be likely to take from Congress, and transfer to some other tribunal, the power to adjust controverted claims, when no law has been passed, nor appropriated made, to pay them; and which will be likely to break down those salutary checks and distinctions between the Legislative and Judicial Departments, as to the disposal of the public money, which the People and the States have, with clearness and wisdom, established in the great charter of their Union. For example views on the law and equity of the whole case, and for any further reply which may be proper to any of the principles advanced in your letter, in support of the extraordinary claims and proceedings of the Bank, you are referred to the late Annual Report from this Department, and to the opinions of the Attorney General that accompany it.

Had the Bank thought more of following, in its own example, the salutary advice it so frankly bestows on others, not to "prejudge" or "discuss" this question of its claim to damages, and had it omitted to "prejudge" or "discuss," it in the report of its committee last December and in your letter now under consideration, the preceding remarks in relation to it would most cheerfully have been forborne. This Department has now, very reluctantly, but in the manner that seemed to be required by the tone and contents of your communication, replied to such portions of it as appeared to merit notice, and can sincerely conclude with the honest and sincere reflections uttered by yourself in behalf of the Bank, that "having done its duty, it is content."

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, yours,
LEVI WOODBURY,
Secretary of the Treasury.
N. BIDDLE, Esq. President of the Bank of the U. S. Philadelphia

FOREIGN NEWS.
From the Boston Commercial Gazette.
LATE AND IMPORTANT FROM EUROPE.

By the packet ship George Washington, Capt. Holdridge, the New York Editors have received London papers to Nov. 23d, and Liverpool to the 24th, both inclusive.

The news is important, both politically and commercially. Since the date of our previous advices, there had been a rise in cotton, amounting to full three farthings per pound. The announcement of the appointment of Lord Wellington as Premier, and the change in the Ministry, had produced the utmost excitement throughout the country, and meetings have been called in every direction to take strong measures in regard to it. The dissolution of the late Ministry appears to have originated entirely with the King, as it is confidently asserted that Lord Melbourne and his colleagues were prepared to remain in office, and to propose a statesman for the King's approval to fill the situation of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Lord Wellington appears to experience much difficulty in forming a new Cabinet, as more than a week has elapsed from the time of his appointment to the date of our last advices, without his having done so. It is proposed in some of the London and other Journals to revive the Political Unions, and a tremendous and overwhelming opposition appears to be forming in London, Glasgow, Dublin, and other places, against the contemplated administration.

The British Parliament has been further prorogued from the 25th of November to the 18th of December.

Mr. Brougham, the late Lord Chancellor, gave up his seals of office on the 21st, after finishing the business before him. He stated to the bar, that no power on earth should induce him to remain in office any longer under the present circumstances. The London Times, which, by the way, has joined the new Tory party, declares that the Queen had not the slightest concern in bringing about the revolution in the cabinet.

A new French Ministry has been formed, with the Duke de Treviso (Marshal Mortier) at its head, and embracing most of the members of the Cabinet as it existed previous to the appointment of the Duke of Bassano.

It is stated in a Liverpool paper, that on the news of the formation of the Bassano Ministry reaching Talleyrand, he immediately sent in his resignation as Ambassador to the Court of London.

There is no news of importance either from Spain or Portugal.

The plague continues its ravages at Constantinople.

EXCITEMENT IN ENGLAND.

England appears to have been thrown into a state of great excitement by the appointment of the Duke of Wellington to the office of Prime Minister. Meetings were held in all the principal cities of the kingdom, to express their dissatisfaction at the new state of affairs. The different parties in the opposition appear to unite in very violent proceedings. One of the latest London papers says:—"The most gratifying feature in to-day's occurrences was the perfect unanimity of all classes and sections of reformers against either the threats or the bribes of a Tory Government. Radicals, ultra Radicals, and Whigs, were everywhere to be seen acting together, and wisely casting aside all minor dissensions, in order to oppose a united front to their common enemy." The same paper speaking of public opinion in the country remarks,—"The most perfect unanimity prevails amongst all classes of reformers throughout the Kingdom. From Kent, Devon, Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, Dorsetshire, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, Nottingham, and in short in almost all the counties in England, we have the strongest assurances that the metropolis does not stand alone in the indignation and disgust with which it views the Tory intrigue. In Scotland and Ireland we have also various accounts that the best possible feeling prevails. All minor differences are laid aside, and the nation stands united as one man."

THE NEW FRENCH MINISTRY.

London, Nov. 22. The papers of the 19th have reached us, and at length we receive the official announcement of the new Ministry. The following appointments appeared in a Royal Ordinance published in the Moniteur of that day:—

President of the Council and Minister of War the Duke de Treviso, (Marshal Mortier); Minister of Interior, M. Thiers; of Foreign Affairs, Admiral de Rigny; of Public Instruction, M. Guizot; of Commerce, M. Duchatel; of Justice, M. Persil; of Finance, H. Humann. From the above list it will be seen that the Cabinet is in fact a restoration of the old Ministry, with substitution of the Duke de Treviso for M. Gerard.

THE NEW ENGLISH MINISTRY.

The following is believed to be the new Ministry, as formed by the Duke of Wellington, Premier:—Lord Lyndhurst, will be Lord Chancellor; Sir James Scarlett, Lord Chief Baron (with a Peersage); Sir Charles M. Stuart, Home Secretary; Sir Robert Peel, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Leader of the House of Commons; Lord Ellenborough, Foreign Secretary; Marquis of Clanricarde, First Lord of the Admiralty; Lord Cowley, President of the Board of Control; Earl of Rosslyn, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; Earl of Aberdeen, Ambassador to France; Lord Stuart de Rathbone, or Lord Munster, Governor General of India; Lord Maryborough, Master of the Horse; Sir Edward Sugden, Attorney General; Mr. Follett or Mr. Pollock, Solicitor General.

Mr. Goulbourn is to be the candidate for the Speaker's chair; and the Standard intimates that if the reformed House of Commons should refuse to install Lord Lyndhurst as Duke of Wellington, an immediate dissolution will be the consequence.

Thirty six persons were drowned in the river Mersey, near Bromborough Pool, Liverpool, on the 17th ult. by the sinking of two ferry boats which were overloaded with passengers. The drowned persons were of a company of spectators who had assembled to witness a pugilistic exhibition.

From the Boston Statesman.

Washington, Wednesday Dec. 17.

A bill very important in its principles and object was taken up in the Senate to-day—I mean Mr. Webster's bill providing compensation for spoils of our commerce prior to 1800. The greater part of the day was consumed in its discussion. Mr. Webster and Mr. Shepley in favor, and Messrs. Benton, Preston and Tyler opposed to it. No definite action was had upon the bill, and it is impossible to say what may be its ultimate fate. It is not viewed with much favor, from the circumstance that the claimants for spoils are believed to be, with few if any exceptions, Insurance companies—corporations "having no souls," and God knows, if we may take the Mammoth in Chestnut street as an illustration of the nature of that genus of animals having no heart either.

In the House, the time, up to the morning hour, was consumed in a debate upon a resolution of inquiry, which involved the tariff question. It was in relation to the abolition of duties upon all rail road iron and cars, and also steam engines; as the debate was arrested at one o'clock, it will be resumed to-morrow. The balance of the day was occupied in discussing the bill increasing the pay of our naval officers. The passage of this bill is loudly called for, but it has an unfortunate foster-father, Mr. Watmough, which has called down upon it more opposition than it deserves. I think the bill will pass, however, in a modified shape.

You will no doubt have seen ere this reach, a denial on the part of the National Intelligencer of the truth of the rumor of a misunderstanding or disagreement existing in the Committee of Finance, relative to certain discoveries having been made in their recent bank investigations, implicating certain distinguished men as the recipients of its bounties to a great amount. It is probable the Intelligencer does not speak without bank on this subject, but we shall see. But it is consolatory to know that, however fair and business-like all its transactions may be represented to be, by the Committee, it cannot give the Hydra an additional breath of life.

We have a rumor here, which I give you, because you will best know its truth, that the Legislature of Massachusetts intend nominating Mr. Webster for the Presidency. Whether he will accept it, or whether a man of his keen penetration shall think it desirable or not, for his further advancement, remains to be seen. It is very clear, to the most casual observation, that the opposition nomination, I mean the opposition to the national convention nomination, is going a-begging.

Washington, Thursday, Dec. 18.

I was not wrong in the conjecture I hazarded last evening, that the National Intelligencer did not speak without book, in denying that dissensions existed among the members of the Committee on Finance relative to their investigations into the situation and affairs of the Bank of the United States.

Mr. Tyler, on the part of the Committee of last year, consisting of Messrs. Webster, Tyler, Mangum and Ewing, made a most voluminous report upon the subject to-day. The document was read by Mr. Lowrie, Mr. Tyler, and Mr. Ewing, alternately, and three hours were consumed in that process. As regards the substance of that document, I may say, in few words, that a more thorough whitewashing or purification report could not have emanated from the Emperor Nicholas himself. The paper, in its very exordium, however, discloses the particular favor with which the Committee was received by the Bank. "Every book and paper was submitted for inspection, and nothing was withheld, which would prevent a full investigation." Not so last year with the Committee of the House.

The Committee did not approve of the unlimited use of the funds of the Bank, which was permitted the President by the Directors, for printing purposes, in self defence, and they stated that a call was made upon Mr. Biddle for his vouchers for these items. To this the Emperor replied, that there could be no objection to giving the vouchers, except that it would be unjust to individuals, and with this apology the Committee were satisfied.

The loans to members of Congress and printing were placed upon one and the same footing—all was perfectly justifiable. But while the committee give the names of editors and printers who have been the happy participants in the bounty of the Money King, they prudently forbear giving the names of the members of Congress who are among his debtors. They say that the Bank has been no loser from its accommodations to members of Congress, but represent the redoubtable Webb of the Courier, Hardin of the Philadelphia Inquirer, and Noah of the Star, as defaulters.

But it is impossible for me, in my limited space, to give you even a bird's-eye view of all the grounds taken by the committee in support of the Bank. It is sufficient to now that it is every thing that the most sanguine friends of the institution could have desired.

Mr. Tyler has been put forward in this affair with a view of operating on Virginia in the next great contest. The Bank is again in the field with all its immense power, willing, anxious, and not without the hope of buying over the Old Dominion, and using her, through the instrumentality of its funds, to promote the advancement of those miserable aspirants, who have nothing to hope for from the unbought intelligence and independence of the people.

In the House, the Resolutions, relative to the tariff upon rail road iron, cars, &c., and the Navy Bill occupied the whole day. Mr. Jackson, of our State, supported the resolution, and the reference of it to the Committee of Ways and Means, and was in favor of repealing the duties, because those articles would be imported at all events, and it was not injuring the home manufacturer, but burdening public improvements, to retain their duties.

The following Resolutions, which were among those passed at the great Democratic Union Festival of the three States of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, lately held on the Battle Ground of Trenton, have annoyed the opposition very much—they see in them the shadows of coming events:— [Bos. States.] Resolved, That it is the duty of Congress to dissolve all future connection with this unconstitutional institution, [The U. S. Bank,] by an immediate sale of the \$7,000,000 of stock held by the Government, and by refusing to receive the notes or bills of the Bank in payment of debts due to the United States, after some early day, to be fixed by law.

Resolved, That in Andrew Jackson we recognize the boy of the revolution, the hero of the last war, and the pure and determined patriot of another revolution bloodless as yet, who with an American firmness has nobly sustained the righteous cause of the people.

Resolved, That in MARTIN VAN BUREN we recognize the undeviating Democrat, the enlightened statesman, who has advanced by the favor of a confiding country, in defiance of the malice of his enemies, to the second office in the gift of the people, and who we trust will

be eventually rewarded by an elevation to that chair which has been adorned by a Washington, a Jefferson, a Madison and a Jackson.

Resolved, That in a National Convention for the selection of candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, we recognize the only Democratic method of preserving the election of those high officers to the people, and that we cheerfully submit to the decision of that Democratic body.

The correspondent of the Boston Post, at Washington, writes that Judge Philip P. Barbour of Virginia, had consented to become a candidate for a seat in the Senate, and that it had not been ascertained that he would be elected by a majority of four or five votes over Mr. Leigh.

State Papers. Our table is so much crowded with public documents and important State papers, that we scarcely know where to begin with or how to dispose of them. The interesting and able report of the Secretary of the Treasury we have been obliged to publish in a condensed form, and the War Report is given in a paragraph. The correspondence between Mr. Woodbury and President Biddle on the subject of the Bank's seizure of the government dividends we intend to publish next week. Of this correspondence the editor of the Richmond Enquirer speaks as follows:—

N. H. Patriot. Mr. Woodbury's Letter. We recommend the correspondence between the Secretary of the United States Bank and the Secretary of the Treasury, to the particular attention of the reader. We have scarcely ever perused so scathing a letter, as Mr. Woodbury's reply. The facts which he states, are conclusive—the arguments powerful—but the satire, with which they are conveyed is tremendously severe. We did not think it was in the Secretary. We should never have suspected it, from what we knew of the character of his mind. He has stripped off all the disguises of the Bank—and the confiscation of the public treasure, which it has attempted, now stands out as one of the most unjustifiable abuses of this arrogant corporation.

MR. POINDEXTER.

Mr. Poindexter, when making speeches in this section of this country, denied in the most unequivocal manner, the charge which has been made against him of his having basely fled from the standard of his country on the 8th January, 1815. He said it was a lie—that where danger was, there was he. We have been repeatedly told, by men who occupied conspicuous stations in the army on the 8th of January, that Mr. Poindexter did run from the battle ground, on the morning of the 8th, at the very commencement of the fight.—Col. Campbell was there, and his valuable services have often been spoken of in terms of high commendation. He is better acquainted with Poindexter's history than any man in the State, and saw him running. At a dinner given to Robert J. Walker, on the 1st instant, at Port Gibson, Colonel Campbell gave the following toast:—

By Col. A. Campbell, an invited guest, from Adams county. George Poindexter.—The coward whom I saw galloping from the standard of his country while the battle was raging on the morning of the battle of the 8th of January, 1815—ought not to be trusted with her rights.—Mississippi.

Federal White-washing.—On Thursday the 18th inst. the Finance Committee of the U. S. Senate made a Report of their investigation of the affairs of the Bank, which consumed upwards of three hours in the ranging, and which exonerates the Bank from most of the charges which have been made against it by the friends of the Administration. It will be remembered that this committee was composed exclusively of opposition members of the Senate, and the consequences has been, as they say it in their Report, that the Bank have allowed them a free and complete examination of all its Books—those which were refused to the Committee of the House of Representatives were cheerfully laid before that of the Senate; and this Committee, as in duty bound, have pronounced the Bank to be honest and pure.

As soon as the reading of the Report was concluded Mr. Benton took the floor, and in one of the most spirited Speeches ever delivered in the Halls of Congress, he exposed the falsehoods and fallacies contained in the Report in a manner which threw the Bankites into the greatest confusion—I vainly they attempted to escape the lash by turning his remarks to ridicule, but it would not answer—every sentiment he uttered was so properly applied that escape was impossible, and the white washing sentiment against the Bank, and sink still deeper the debased characters of its servile advocates. We shall publish Mr. Benton's speech the first opportunity we have.

[Dover Gazette.]

A Dilemma. The Whigs not unfrequently find themselves placed in rather ridiculous positions in consequence of their almost innumerable changes of name. A Swig Convention was recently held in one of the Western States, near the close of which a discussion arose as to the name by which the next convention should be called. This was somewhat of a puzzle to them. But the difficulty was finally settled by authorizing the Secretary to call the next year's convention "by such name as the whig party shall then be known by." The whigs are very fond of trying "experiments" in this line, but they have thus far been woefully disappointed in their results.—[The Age.]

THE ACQUITTAL OF BUZZELL.

The Boston Transcript, in speaking of the acquittal of Buzzell, said to be the ring leader of the Convent Rioters, says, under the significant caption of "How it was done?"

"We learn that when the jury in the case of Buzzell, retired to their room after the charge of the Judge, they were seven for conviction and five for acquittal. On Friday morning, before they left their room, they were ten for acquittal and two for conviction; but on the way from their room to the court house, the two suddenly changed their minds, and agreed to acquit. This beats a jury's making all round for damages, and then taking the average!"

These Charleston trials will we suspect, reflect, a greater disgrace upon our country than the Charleston riot, arson, and murder. So far at least the proceedings are regarded and spoken of by all intelligent persons, beyond the influence of the Charleston mob, as a bitter mockery of justice, and a mere farce. It would be better to proclaim an immunity to all like offenders, than that the laws may not be looked to as a protection, and that those who do not please a ruffian gang may learn in time that they must rely for safety on their own energies. Perhaps it is scarcely becoming in us to speak strongly on this subject, when the riots in our vicinity are remembered, which resulted in the destruction of so much property, and in the murder of the old man, James, and in that of Mr. Lamb, for which not even measures of investigation have been taken; but these acts were almost creditable when compared with the cowardly attack on the Ursuline Convent, occupied as it was with defenceless women and children.

Scalding Hogs. A gentleman of experience and observation desires us to make known for the benefit of farmers, a mode practised by him of scalding hogs. Instead of putting cold water or ashes into hot water, as is the general practice, he washes the hog in cold water previous to scalding it. It matters not how hot the water may be with which the hog is scalded, if cold water is first used in the way prescribed, the hair can be taken off with ease and neatness. No danger need be apprehended of the hair becoming set, as is often the case when this mode is not resorted to, owing to a particular temperature of the water.

The gentleman who communicated to us this mode, says he has practised it for more than twenty years, and has not, during that time, experienced any difficulty in scalding hogs.

In dressing a young pig for roasting, he first dips it in cold water and then in hot, by which process he is enabled to remove the hair with the least possible trouble. — [Wilmington Herald.]

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.
For Services as County Commissioner.

1833.		
Nov. 5.	To travel from Brownfield to Bridgton, on petition of Samuel Andrews & others, 20 miles.	2,00
6.	To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on sd. Pt. 13,00	
	To travel home, 20 miles.	2,00
12.	To travel from Brownfield to Kingfield on petition of Charles Dolbier and others, in Somerset County, 110 miles.	11,00
13.	Met the Co. Commissioners of said County and found their Notices not legal and adjourned 1 day.	3,00
16.	To travel home 110 miles.	1,00
Dec. 5.	To travel from Brownfield to Watford on petition of Caleb Stevens and others, 26 miles.	2,60
6.	To 2 days viewing and hearing the parties.	6,00
7.	To travel home 32 miles.	3,20
		\$52,80

ABEL GIBSON.

Oxford, ss: January 30th, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
TIMO. J. CARTER, Co. Atty.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To JAMES STARR, Dr.
For Services as County Commissioner.

1833.		
Nov. 5.	To travel from Jay to Bridgton on Notice from Cumberland Co. Com'rs on petition of Samuel Andrews and als. 50 miles.	5,00
	To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on sd. Pt. 12,00	
	To travel from Col. Navers in Sweden home, 50 miles.	5,00
	To one day making a return and plan of the location of said road.	3,00
	To one day making return of adjudication on petition of L. Baily and J. K. Fuller, als. T. Merrill and als.	3,00
19.	To travel from Jay to Kingfield Village on notice from Somerset Co. Com'rs on Pet. of Charles Dolbier and als. and back to Jay, 88 miles.	8,80
	To one day on said petition.	3,00
20.	To travel from Jay to Cheney's Mills, Livermore, on notice from Kennebec Co. Com'rs on Pet. of Sam'l Morrison and als. and back to Jay, 7 miles.	70
	To 1-2 day with said Com'rs on said Pt. and adjourned.	1,50
26.	To travel on said Pt. to Livermore on the adjournment, 3	

1-2 miles.

To 5 days viewing, hearing the parties on said petition. 15,00

To travel from Wayne home on said Pt., 13 miles. 1,30

To travel from Jay to Watford on Caleb Stevens and als. Pt., 41 miles. 4,10

To 2 days on joint view with Cumb. Co. Com'rs on sd. Pt. To travel from Harrison Village home on sd. Pt. 49 miles. 4,90

To making a joint return of doings on said Pt. 1-2 day. 1,50

1834.

May 5. To travel from Jay to Denmark on Parson Pingree's and als. Pt. 120 miles home. 12,00

To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on sd. Pt. 12,00

To one day making return & plan of location. 3,00

To travel from Fryeburg on notice from Cumberland County Com'rs on Pt. of Inhabitants of Bridgton, & home, 124 miles. 12,40

To 6 days in joint view, making plan of view, and hearing parties and adjudication. 18,00

To 1 2 day making a joint return of adjudication. 1,50

June 13. To travel from Jay to Paris on Asaph Kittredg's and als. Pt. and home 60 miles. 6,00

To 1 day on said Petition. 1,50

To travel from Jay to Thayer's in Paris on Sam'l F. Brown & als. Pt. 27 miles. 2,70

To 1 day viewing on said Pt. 3,00

To 1 day writing notices to Cumberland and Kennebec Com'rs as to time of view. 3,00

To Stationary used in Com'rs business. 1,00

151,25

The above account is true as to time charged and distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief. JAMES STARR.

Oxford, ss: June 19, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.

1834.		
May 7.	To travel from Brownfield to Denmark on Pt. of Parson Pingree and others 10 miles.	1,00
8.	To 2 days viewing and hearing the parties	6,00
	Adjourned to the 15th. Travel home, 10 miles.	1,00
9.	To travel from Brownfield to Fryeburg 3 1-2 miles, on Pt. of John Pearley, Sam'l Farnsworth, and Asa Ingalls in behalf of the Inhabitants of Bridgton.	35
10.	To 2 days viewing from Fryeburg to Bridgton.	6,00
12.	To travel home & back to Bridgton Centre, 32 miles.	3,20
16.	To 3 days viewing different routes from Bridgton back to Fryeburg, and hearing the parties.	9,00
	To travel home, 3 1-2 miles.	35
15.	On Pet. of Parson Pingree and others	
	To travel to said Pingree's in Denmark, 10 miles.	1,00
16.	To 2 days locating.	6,00
	To travel home, 10 miles.	1,00
June 12.	To travel from Brownfield to Col. Eben'r Rawson's in Paris on Pt. of Asaph Kittredg and others, 38 miles.	3,80
13.	To 1-2 day attendance on said petition.	1,50
	To travel home, 38 miles.	3,80
	To travel from Brownfield to Mr. Thayer's in Paris on Petition of Sam'l F. Brown and others 38 miles.	3,80
16.	To 1 day attendance and adj.	3,00

The above account is true as to time charged and distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief. ABEL GIBSON.

Oxford, ss: June 19, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To JOB PRINCE, Dr.
For Services as County Commissioner.

1834.		
May 5.	To travel from Turner to Denmark on petition of Parson Pingree and others, 47 miles.	4,70
	To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating.	12,00
	To travel home, 47 miles.	4,70
	To travel from home to Eben'r Walker's in Brownfield, 10 miles.	1,00
Jug. 30.	To 2 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	6,00
	To travel home, 12 miles.	1,20
Sept. 17.	On Pet. of Robert Goodenow and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to Asa Francis in Livermore, 60 miles.	6,00
Sept. 17.	To 6 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	18,00
	On Pet. of Asaph Kittredg and others.	
	To travel from Turner to Col. Rawson's in Paris 15 miles.	1,50
19.	To 2 days viewing (notice not complied with) To travel home, 36 miles.	3,60
	On Pet. of George F. Richardson and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to Moses Merrill's in Andover, 50 miles.	5,00
24.	To 3 days viewing (notice not complied with) To travel home, 50 miles.	5,00
	On Pet. of John Dodge and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to John Hankerson's in Township No. 1, 1st Range 100 mi.	10,00
Oct. 12.	To 5 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	15,00

The above account is true as to time charged and distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief. JOB PRINCE.

ed and distance traveled according to my best

knowledge and belief. JOB PRINCE.
Oxford, ss: June 19, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To MOSES MASON JR., Dr.

1833.		
Nov. 9.	To travel from Bethel to Bridgton, 25 miles.	2,50
	To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating a road on the Pt. of Sam'l Andrews & others.	12,00
	To travel from Sweden to Bethel 26 miles.	2,60
16.	To travel from Bethel to Kingfield & back to Bethel 164 miles.	16,40
	To one day attendance on the Pet. of Dolbier and others.	3,00
Dec. 2.	To travel to Samuel Memmons in Livermore, 50 miles.	5,00
	To 4 days viewing and hearing the parties.	12,00
	To travel from said Memmons to Bethel.	5,00
		\$58,50

MOSES MASON JR.
Oxford, ss: August 22, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To JAMES STARR, Dr.
For Services as County Commissioner.

1834.		
July 4.	To 1 day making returns and plan of Roads.	
	On Pet. of Sam'l E. Spring & als.	
Aug. 26.	Travel from Jay to Brownfield Centre, 70 miles.	7,00
	To 3 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	9,00
	On Pet. of Stephen Rounds and als.	
Aug. 29.	Travel from Brownfield centre to Eben'r Walker's in Brownfield, 6 miles.	60
	To 3 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	9,00
	Travel from Sam'l Greenlaw's in Brownfield home, 73 miles.	7,30
	On Pet. of Robert Goodenow and als.	
Sept. 12.	Travel from Jay to Asa Francis's, Livermore, 9 miles.	90
	To 2 days on that part of this road lying in Livermore.	6,00
	Travel from Abijah Child's in Livermore home, 6 miles.	60
15.	Travel from home to North Turner Post Office, 13 miles.	1,30
	To 3 days viewing, hearing parties and making returns.	9,00
	On Pet. of Asaph Kittredg and als.	
18.	Travel from Maj. Prince's in Turner to Col. Eben'r Rawson's in Paris, 17 miles.	1,70
	To 2 days viewing (Pet. failed). Travel from said Rawson's home 28 miles.	6,00
	On Pet. of Geo. F. Richardson and als.	
22.	Travel from Jay to Moses Merrill's, Andover, 38 miles.	3,80
	To 3 days viewing, (Pet. failed). Travel from said Merrill's home, 38 miles.	3,80
	On Pet. of John Dodge and als.	
Oct. 7.	Travel from Jay to John Hankerson's Plantation No. 1, 40 miles.	4,00
	To 5 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	15,00
	Pet. of Charles Dolbier & als. on joint view with Somerset Com'rs.	
13.	Travel from said John Hankerson's to Kingfield Village 20 miles.	2,00
	To 6 days & a half, viewing, hearing parties and locating.	19,50
	Travel from Kingfield Village home, 40 miles.	4,00
	On Pet. of Asaph Kittredg and als.	
24.	Travel from Jay to said Kittredg's in Paris, 23 miles.	2,30
	To 4 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	12,00

I certify on oath, that the above account is true as to the distance traveled, according to the best of my knowledge and belief, and true as to time charged. JAMES STARR.

Oxford, ss: October Term, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.
For Services as County Commissioner.

1834.		
Aug. 27 & 28.	To travel to Brownfield Centre 4 mi.	40
Sept. 1.	To 3 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating.	9,00
	On petition of Stephen Rounds and others.	
	To travel from home to Eben'r Walker's in Brownfield, 10 miles.	1,00
Jug. 30.	To 2 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	6,00
	To travel home, 12 miles.	1,20
Sept. 17.	On Pet. of Robert Goodenow and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to Asa Francis in Livermore, 60 miles.	6,00
Sept. 17.	To 6 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	18,00
	On Pet. of Asaph Kittredg and others.	
	To travel from Turner to Col. Rawson's in Paris 15 miles.	1,50
19.	To 2 days viewing (notice not complied with) To travel home, 36 miles.	3,60
	On Pet. of George F. Richardson and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to Moses Merrill's in Andover, 50 miles.	5,00
24.	To 3 days viewing (notice not complied with) To travel home, 50 miles.	5,00
	On Pet. of John Dodge and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to John Hankerson's in Township No. 1, 1st Range 100 mi.	10,00
Oct. 12.	To 5 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	15,00

I certify on oath, that the above account is true as to the distance traveled, according to the best of my knowledge and belief, and true as to time charged. ABEL GIBSON.

Oxford, ss: October Term, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.

1834.		
Aug. 27 & 28.	To travel to Brownfield Centre 4 mi.	40
Sept. 1.	To 3 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating.	9,00
	On petition of Stephen Rounds and others.	
	To travel from home to Eben'r Walker's in Brownfield, 10 miles.	1,00
Jug. 30.	To 2 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	6,00
	To travel home, 12 miles.	1,20
Sept. 17.	On Pet. of Robert Goodenow and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to Asa Francis in Livermore, 60 miles.	6,00
Sept. 17.	To 6 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	18,00
	On Pet. of Asaph Kittredg and others.	
	To travel from Turner to Col. Rawson's in Paris 15 miles.	1,50
19.	To 2 days viewing (notice not complied with) To travel home, 36 miles.	3,60
	On Pet. of George F. Richardson and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to Moses Merrill's in Andover, 50 miles.	5,00
24.	To 3 days viewing (notice not complied with) To travel home, 50 miles.	5,00
	On Pet. of John Dodge and others.	
	To travel from Brownfield to John Hankerson's in Township No. 1, 1st Range 100 mi.	10,00
Oct. 12.	To 5 days viewing, hearing parties and locating.	15,00

On pet. of Charles Dolbier and others.

To travel from John Hankerson's in Township No. 1, 1st Range, to Kingfield, Somerset County, 30 miles. 3,00

To 6 & 1-2 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating. 19,50

On pet. of Asaph Kittredg and others. 11,00

To travel from Brownfield to sd. Kittredg's in Paris, 42 miles. 4,20

Oct. 30. To 4 days viewing, hearing the parties and locating on said pet. 12,00

I certify on oath that the within account is true as to the distance traveled, according to my best knowledge and belief, and true as to the time charged. ABEL GIBSON.

Oxford, ss: October Term, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To JOB PRINCE, Dr.
For Services as County Commissioner.

1834.		
Aug. 26.	To travel from Turner to Brownfield on pet. of Sam'l E. Spring & als. 57 mi.	5,70
	To 4 days viewing, hearing parties & locating. 9,00	
	To travel from Brownfield centre to Ebenezer Walker's on pet. of Stephen Rounds and others, 6 miles.	60
	To viewing, hearing the parties and locating on said petition 3 days.	9,00
	To travel from Sam'l Greenlaw's in Brownfield home, 60 miles.	6,00
Sept. 12.	To travel from Turner to Asa Francis's in Livermore on pet. of Robert Goodenow and others, 10 miles.	1,00
	To viewing, hearing the parties and locating 2 days.	6,00
	To travel from Abijah Charles's in Livermore home, 14 miles.	1,40
15.	To travel from home to N. Turner Post Office, 7 miles.	70
	To viewing, hearing the parties and making returns, 3 days.	9,00
18.	To travel from Turner to Col. Rawson's in Paris on pet. of Asaph Kittredg and others, 17 miles.	1,70
	To viewing 2 days (petition failed).	6,00
22.	To travel from Turner to Andover on pet. of George F. Richardson & als. 44 miles.	4,40
	To viewing 3 days (petition failed).	9,00
	To travel from Moses Merrill's in Andover home, 15 miles.	1,50
Oct. 7.	To travel from Turner to John Hankerson's in No. 1, on pet. of John Dodge & als. 60 mi.	6,00
	To viewing, hearing parties and locating 5 days.	15,00
13.	To travel from John Hankerson's in No. 1 to Kingfield on joint view with Somerset Com'rs on pet. Ch. Dolbier and als. 20 mi.	2,00
	To viewing, hearing the parties and locating 6 1-2 days.	10,50
	To travel from Kingfield home, 60 miles.	6,00
25.	To travel from Turner to Asaph Kittredg's in Paris on pet. of said Kittredg, 20 miles.	2,00
	To viewing, hearing the parties and locating 4 days.	12,00

I certify on oath that the above account is true as to distance traveled according to my best knowledge and belief, and true as to time charged. JOB PRINCE.

Oxford, ss: Oct. Term, 1834.
Sworn to before me,
R. K. GOODENOW, Clerk.

COUNTY OF OXFORD

To ABEL GIBSON, Dr.

1834.		
June Term, A. D. 1834.		
James Starr, travel 60 mi., \$6, attendance 4 days, \$12.	\$6,12	
Abel Gibson, " 90 " 9 " 3 " 9, 12.	9,12	
Job Prince, " 40 " 4 " 3 " 9, 13.	9,13	
OCTOBER TERM, A. D. 1834.		
James Starr, travel 50 mi., \$5, attendance 4 days, \$12.	\$5,12	
Abel Gibson, " 10 " 9 " 4 " 12, 21.	12,21	
Job Prince, " 40 " 4 " 4 " 12, 16.	12,16	

The foregoing accounts were severally examined, audited and found correct by the County Attorney and Clerk agreeably to the Statute, and are truly copied by me to collect, for the year 1833, as follows:

"	B	19	40	81		81	
C	18	100	100	2 04	5 46	7 50	
"	19	100	150	3 06		3 06	
A	19	100	100	2 04		2 04	
D	18	135	150	3 06		3 06	
"	19	135	150	3 06		3 06	
E	16	100	150	3 06		3 06	
"	17	60	60	1 22		1 22	
G	5	95	95	1 93		1 93	
"	3	100	150	3 06		3 06	
"	2	50	50	1 02	2 76	3 78	
"	7	70	50	1 02		1 02	
"	4	50	50		2 76	2 76	
"	3	50	100		5 47	5 47	
"	7	70	55		3 00	3 00	

And unless said taxes and all necessary intervening charges shall be paid to the subscriber, on or before

**ISSUE
MISSING**

ISSUE
MISSING